

Elina Suomela-Härmä, Juhani Härmä and Eva Havu (eds),  
*Représentations des formes d'adresse dans les langues romanes* —  
*Representaciones de las formas de tratamiento en las lenguas románicas*  
— *Rappresentazioni di forme allocutive nelle lingue romanze. Mémoires*  
*de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki*, vol. LXXXIX. Helsinki: Société  
Néophilologique. 2013. v. + 328 pp. ISBN 978-951-9040-45-5, ISSN  
0355-0192

**Reviewed by Bart Defrancq (Ghent University, Belgium, Department  
of Translation, Interpreting and Communication)**

The book edited by Elina Suomela-Härmä, Juhani Härmä and Eva Havu is a collection of papers investigating a classic topic in pragmatics, called 'referent honorifics' by Levinson (1983), i.e. linguistic choices made by speakers to address hearers. These include deictic elements used to refer to the hearer (the so-called T- and V-forms), and names and titles used as vocatives. Only some papers cover the second dimension. The book analyses social deixis in four Romance languages: French, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese. The data it is based on are drawn from surveys and corpora of novels and films. In the Introduction (pp. 1–5), the editors of the volume explain that the purpose of the presented research was not to investigate the actual usage of social deixis, but rather its representation in the minds of surveyed speakers of the languages, and in the minds of authors. However, this research programme was only partially carried out, as only the data available for French and Italian are complete. The book does not cover social deixis in Spanish and Portuguese cinematography, nor in Portuguese literature.

The volume is structured according to language: papers on one language are grouped together in chapters, starting with the paper based on survey data. The relevance of the research is explained in a short introduction and some contrastive conclusions are drawn in a concluding chapter (pp. 285–292). The volume is relevant for contrastive studies in several respects: the methodology applied across the different languages is very similar, allowing for detailed comparisons; the investigated phenomena are relevant for the field of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural (socio-)pragmatics and the generated data add to our knowledge of differentiated evolution in languages with a common ancestor.

In this review, I will group papers based on a shared methodology, as this is most relevant from a contrastive point of view. There are four papers based on

survey data: the papers by Sanromán Vilas on Spanish, Havu on French, Suomela-Härmä on Italian and Melo e Abreu on Portuguese. The surveys used for the different languages are nearly identical and aim at eliciting data from the surveyees on the use of pronouns and verbal morphology in different social contexts. Surveyee groups are large ( $N > 500$ ) and authors clearly sought to ensure representativeness in terms of age groups and geographical distribution. An adapted version of the questionnaire was used for the youngest participants. The survey method is explained in detail for different groups of participants, as it turned out that particular age groups could only be successfully involved through specific surveying methods (involving, for instance, education staff in the case of young participants and oral surveying in the case of the oldest participants). While for three out of four languages, these methodological precautions guarantee reliable results, the Portuguese survey falls short on many of them: the number of surveyees is much lower ( $N=175$ ) and age and geographical distribution is less fine-grained than in the other cases.

The survey results are unsurprising, confirming the general tendencies described in the literature: in all languages, younger generations tend to use T-forms in more contexts than older generations; nuclear family contexts clearly favour T-forms in all languages, while considerable uncertainty arises in the case of family members who do not belong to the nuclear family (in-laws, uncles and aunts, grand-parents); friendship is also an exclusive T-area, while professional contexts still prompt a considerable share of V-forms. As far as the contrastive perspective is concerned, Spanish stands out, as T-forms are used in considerably higher proportions and in more contexts than in the other languages.

Three papers in the volume provide analyses of social deixis in a corpus of novels: the papers by Anton Granvik on Spanish, by Juhani Härmä on French and by Ciro Imperato on Italian. Methodologically, these corpus-based analyses are more varied than the surveys: on the one hand, the selection of novels varies both in size and in genre across languages; on the other hand, while the papers on French and Italian provide a detailed analysis of the use of nominal vocatives, the Spanish section only lists them without any further comment. The presentation of the data is identical in all three contributions: the observed configurations of T- and V-forms are listed and the contexts in which they occur are categorised, so that the results can be compared to the survey data. Unsurprisingly, the corpus-based observations support the conclusions drawn from the survey data. Of special interest are the analyses of cases in which the use of T- and V-forms is explicitly negotiated by the novels' characters, as they provide evidence that can hardly be recorded or prompted through other research methods. Härmä shows that negotiation is particularly frequent in French novels and frequently occurs in contexts where the survey data too signal considerable uncertainty. Both Härmä

and Imperato find that elements of social deixis are used by the authors to signal the social status of the novels' characters.

Finally, two papers focus on social deixis in a corpus of transcribed films: Johanna Isosävi's paper deals with French films, while Riikka Ala-Risku's paper concentrates on Italian films. As in the papers based on the literary corpora, the approach taken here aims at matching T- and V-configuration with particular contexts depicted in the films. Again, the findings generally support the survey conclusions.

In all, Elina Suomela-Härmä, Juhani Härmä and Eva Havu have managed to present an interesting volume: the varied but cross-linguistically uniform methodologies allow for solid conclusions on each language separately, while facilitating cross-linguistic comparison. The focus of the research is mainly descriptive: some papers lack theoretical background and little has been done to interpret the data from a theoretical point of view. Especially illustrative in this respect is the fact that seminal work in the field of social deixis is not even mentioned in the bibliography (Fillmore 1975, Levinson 1983). As far as technical aspects are concerned, the volume is up to the normal standards and readers will appreciate the concise summary of results at the end of each linguistic chapter. However, the survey data could have been presented in a more reader-friendly way (graphs instead of tables) and should have been standardised throughout the volume.

## References

- Fillmore, C. 1975. *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis*. Indiana University Linguistics Club.  
Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.